

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

BRIGHT RESPONSE, LLC,  
Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE, INC., et al.,  
Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No. 2:07-cv-371-ce

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**ORDER**

On this day the Court considered Motion in Limine No. 1 of Plaintiff Bright Response, LLC (“Bright Response”). Bright Response requests an order excluding numerous items that have been inadequately disclosed, such as not charted and therefore cannot support the expert opinion of Defendants’ expert Dr. Branting. Specifically, Plaintiff requests the Court to preclude any reliance or reference to as prior art references the CBR Express references manuals for an anticipation theory, as well as the EZ Reader manual, a distinct publication from the EZ Reader article that has been the subject of Defendants’ invalidity contentions. The Court finds that the Motion should be and is hereby GRANTED in its entirety.